

### Remarks/Arguments

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20, 26-30, and 34 – 43 are pending; Claims 1, 10, 20, and 34 are amended; and Claims 36 – 43 are added by the present amendment. Support for changes to the claims and new claims are found at least in paragraphs 21 – 29 and Applicants' Figure 4 and the corresponding written description in the specification. Thus, no new matter is added.

The outstanding Official Action rejected Claims 1-20, 26-30, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0023230 to Bolnick, et al. (hereinafter "*Bolnick*") and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0104018 to Singhani, et al. (hereinafter "*Singhani*").

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that the text of all withdrawn claims are included herein in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of an interview conducted between Applicants' representatives and the Examiner on December 9, 2008. During the interview, Applicants' representatives discussed the differences between Applicants' Figure 4 and *Singhani*. Applicants' representatives further discussed proposed claim amendments and explained that *Singhani* failed to disclose or suggest "formatting ... said electronic information product to a customized version corresponding to said custom display format." Upon further review, the examiner agreed that the prior art of record failed to disclose or suggest these features, indicating this in a follow-up telephone call to the undersigned on December 18, 2008. Amendments and arguments presented during the interview are reiterated below.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to an internet delivery method delivering electronic information products to a plurality of users via the internet. The method includes, *inter alia*, "delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is said type of user, a system display page formatted in said custom display format, said system display page including a list of one or more electronic information products." The method further includes "formatting, upon determination that the authenticated user is said specific type of user, said electronic information product to a customized version corresponding to said custom display format via retrieving one or more information items from said one or more content databases." The method also includes

“delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is said specific type of user, said customized version of said electronic information product.”

Now turning to the applied references, *Singhani* describes a system providing “a way for users to access all e-business applications through a specialized site.”<sup>1</sup> *Singhani* describes this specialized site as a “personalized Supplier Portal home page which displays a list of links to all of the applications for which that particular ... [user] has been registered and authorized.”<sup>2</sup>

Claim 1 is distinguishable over *Singhani* as the applied reference fails to disclose or suggest “formatting ... said electronic information product to a customized version corresponding to said custom display format via retrieving one or more information items from said one or more content databases.” Particularly, as discussed above, *Singhani* describes that a user can access a personalized page via a portal to view any application the user is authorized to use. *Singhani* neither discloses nor suggests that any of the applications in the portal of *Singhani* are formatted to a customized version corresponding to a custom display format. That is, *Singhani* merely describes general use of an application without any customization of the application for the user. Thus, *Singhani* fails to disclose or suggest “formatting ... said electronic information product to said custom display format via retrieving one or more information items from said one or more content databases,” as recited in amended Claim 1, and as agreed by the Examiner.

As also agreed by the Examiner, the prior art of record including *Bolnick* fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of amended Claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Singhani* and *Bolnick* fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of Claim 1 discussed above. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 USC § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 20, and 34 are amended to recite features analogous to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Singhani* and *Bolnick* fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in Claims 10, 20, and 34. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 10, 20, and 34, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 USC § 103(a) be withdrawn.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Singhani* at Paragraph 37.

<sup>2</sup> See *Singhani* at Paragraph 63.

### New Claims

New Claim 36 recites that the “customized electronic information product includes information associated with embedding said customized electronic information product in said display page.” New Claims 38, 40, and 42 recite features analogous to New Claim 36. Applicants have considered *Singhani* and *Bolnick* and submit that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in new Claims 36, 38, 40, and 42. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 36, 38, 40, and 42 are patentable over the applied references.

New Claim 37 recites “accessing an application framework communicable with one or more services associated with said electronic information product,” and “retrieving, via said application framework, information associated with said custom display format from said one or more services.” New Claims 39, 41, and 43 recite features analogous to Claim 37. Applicants have considered *Singhani* and *Bolnick* and submit that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in new Claims 37, 39, 41, and 43. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 37, 39, 41, and 43 are patentable over the applied references.

### U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0007287 (Straube et al.)<sup>3</sup>

U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0007287 to Straube et al. (hereinafter “*Straube*”) describes an ***application service provider (ASP) model warehouse*** system for electronic archiving and retrieval of medical documents.<sup>4</sup> Applicants submit that Claim 1 is distinguishable over *Straube* as the reference fails to disclose or suggest “delivering ... a system display page formatted in said custom display format, said system display page including a list of one or more electronic information products,” and “formatting ... said electronic information product to a customized version corresponding to said custom display format.”

Particularly, *Straube* generally describes “a system for electronic archiving and retrieval of medical documents which provides user with a graphical interface that may be used to store, organize, locate, and retrieve files.”<sup>5</sup> *Straube* describes that this graphical user interface allows users to view an organizational scheme (e.g. tree structure) displaying icons representing

<sup>3</sup> This reference was brought to Applicants’ attention by the Examiner during the aforementioned interview.

<sup>4</sup> See *Straube* at Paragraph 10. (Emphasis added).

documents available for browsing.<sup>6</sup> *Straube* further describes that “users can customize a view or create their own views.”<sup>7</sup> However, *Straube* fails to disclose or suggest that any of the documents in *Straube* are formatted “to a customized version corresponding to said custom display format,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Straube* fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent Claim 1. As independent Claims 10, 20, and 34 are amended to recite features analogous to Claim 1, Applicants submit that *Straube* fails to disclose or suggest the feature recited in independent Claims 10, 20, and 34.

Applicants submit that *Straube* fails to disclose or suggest that “said customized electronic information product includes information associated with embedding said customized electronic information product in said display page,” as recited in new Claims 36, 38, and 42, and as similarly recited in new Claim 40.

Applicants submit that *Straube* fails to disclose or suggest “accessing an application framework communicable with one or more services associated with said electronic information product,” and “retrieving, via said application framework, information associated with said custom display format from said one or more services,” as recited in new Claims 37 and 43, and as similarly recited in new Claims 39 and 41.

### **Conclusion**

Consequently, in view of the present response and amendments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in a condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

---

<sup>5</sup> See *Straube* at Paragraph 10.

<sup>6</sup> See *Straube* at Paragraph 44.

<sup>7</sup> See *Straube* at Paragraph 45.

**Request for a Telephone Interview**

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-607-3500.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

By:     /Soumya Panda/                      
Soumya (Soum) P. Panda  
Reg. No. 60,447  
303.607.3731  
Customer No.: 35657

Dated: December 18, 2008  
fb.us.3390806.05